U.S. Department of Education

2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [ ] Title I [ ] Charter [ ] Magnet [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Tara Owen
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Northeast Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1705 NE Trilein
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Ankeny State IA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 50021-4550

County Polk County State School Code Number*

Telephone 515-965-9620 Fax 515-965-9621

Web site/URL http://www.ankenyschools.org E-mail al.neppl@ankenyschools.org

Twitter Handle
@AnkenySchools Facebook Page Google+

YouTube/URL Blog Other Social Media Link

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Bruce Kimpston
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

E-mail:
bruce.kimpston@ankenyschools.org

District Name Ankeny Comm School District Tel. 515-965-9600

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mr. Todd Shafer
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school's application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.

6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.

7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.

8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
   9 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
   4 Middle/Junior high schools
   2 High schools
   0 K-12 schools

   15 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

   [ ] Urban or large central city
   [ ] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [X] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [ ] Rural

3. 6 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	76	65	141
K	61	59	120
1	36	46	82
2	41	40	81
3	39	42	81
4	51	50	101
5	42	46	88
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	346	348	694

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
5 % Asian
1 % Black or African American
5 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
87 % White
2 % Two or more races
100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 5%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	**Answer**
(1) Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	19
(2) Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	16
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	35
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	688
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.051
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	5

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 4 %
25 Total number ELL
Number of non-English languages represented: 8
Specify non-English languages: Bosnian, Spanish, Telugu, Twi, Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Arabic

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 7 %
Total number students who qualify: 49

If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.
The actual percentage of free-reduced is 7.12% of the PK-5th grade students.

9. Students receiving special education services: 9 %
65 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

5 Autism	2 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	0 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	1 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	3 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
2 Mental Retardation	2 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
2 Multiple Disabilities	2 Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	22
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	17
Paraprofessionals	39
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	2

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 23:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	97%	97%	96%	97%	97%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**
Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

Post-Secondary Status	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.
Yes No X

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

Northeast Elementary School is one of nine elementary schools within the Ankeny School District. Typically there are approximately 640 students enrolled at Northeast each year. This year the current K-5 student enrollment is 553 students along with 141 pre-school students for a total of 694 students. The school is part of a rapidly growing suburban community in which over 500 total new students moved into the district for this school year. Recently the school district made the move to two high schools along with K-12 feeder systems as the total student population for the district approaches 10,000.

The mission statement for the district is, "Ankeny Community Schools is unified in its commitment, passion, and vision so every learner is prepared to achieve a lifetime of personal success." This mission state describes our core purpose and what makes our district distinct. At Northeast we honor the same mission statement by focusing on every learner each day. Our district and school vision is one focused student engagement and accountability, pushing students to reach their potential and preparing them for beyond their K-12 education, and providing for individualized and challenging programming. We specifically seek out educators that are of high quality and focused on student learning while integrating technology. All of our school leaders, including our principal, are focused on continuous improvement for themselves and the students we serve.

Recently in November of 2013, Northeast Elementary School was one of 6 schools in the state of Iowa to be recognized for a "Breaking Barriers Award." Our school was recognized specifically in the area of dramatic improvements in the proficiency of students with IEP's. In Iowa on average, only 32.31% of students with IEP’s are proficient in reading and math or 67% fall short of the state expectations. At Northeast, our students with IEP’s are averaging 75.86% proficiency in reading and math. To break that down, 72.41% are proficient in reading and 79.31% are proficient in math. You will not see these figures within the data presented for his application as the number of IEP students served does not constitute a subgroup, however our school staff and parents are very proud of this award.

The Northeast Elementary School neighborhood is one made up of many young professional families. The support for the school is tremendous as demonstrated by the number of parent volunteers, visitors, and an active PTO(Parent Teacher Organization). Many of our parents find time to come into our classrooms to support the teachers and to work with students to support their academic learning. Our overall student percentage of free/reduced priced meals is 7 percent. While this number is low by most school comparisons, it is similar to the rest of our school district. The number of students with Individualized Education Plans is 9 percent of our student population.

Over the last six years we have worked very hard at meeting the high expectations of our parents and community while keeping the individual learner differences of our students in mind. Our teachers and school leaders have worked to ensure that all students are receiving intentional and targeted instruction. All of our schools have been part of an extensive and rigorous curriculum review over the past 6 years as well in which all five core areas at the elementary level were reviewed, new curriculum were written and new materials were adopted. We worked very hard to implement the new curriculum and materials with fidelity and consistency among our classrooms.

As part of the curriculum review process we identified needed professional learning opportunities that were responsive to teachers and staff needs. We have focused on the implementation of professional learning communities, building curricular and content area background, formative assessments, analyzing data, the integration of technology tools and applications, and differentiation to meet learner needs. As teachers were engaged in this learning two areas of additional interest evolved. The first area that we wanted to learn more about and increase our effectiveness with was in the area of student interventions. We were all aware of students who were in need of additional learning opportunities. We established a student assistance team which will be explained in more detail later in this application.

As our teachers were learning their new curriculum and learning more about the importance of teacher collaboration, we had several teachers who expressed an interest in co-teaching to support students, particularly special education students. Over the last few years we have had teachers, special education and general education, working together co-teaching to support students with IEP's in the area of math and reading in 4th and 5th grade. We believe the co-teaching along with all of the learning opportunities has resulted in our recent data and acknowledgement on the part of the Iowa Department of Education.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a.) In Iowa the common standardized assessment has been the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills/Iowa Assessments. Proficiency in the state has been achieving at the 40th percentile or higher on these ITBS and more recently our state has started to look at standard scores within the new updated Iowa Assessments. The standard scores that are used to determine a student's achievement level for the midyear assessment for third grade in reading are 170 for proficient, >208 for advanced. For fourth grade reading, the standard score for proficient is 185, >230 for advanced. The standard score for proficiency in fifth grade reading is 198, >247 for advanced. The standard scores that are used to determine a students' achievement level for the midyear assessment for third grade mathematics are 173 for proficient, >197 for advanced. The fourth grade standard score for proficiency in math is 185, >216 for advanced. The standard score for proficiency in fifth grade math is 197, >235 for advanced.

When looking at 3rd graders scores from the last five years in the area of math, our students have scored very well. Each year we are examining a different group of students, but overall the student proficiency levels have increased from 89% proficient or higher in 2008-2009 school year to 93% in the 2012-2013 school year. For the same students in the area of reading, scores have ranged from 85% of the students being proficient in the 2008-2009 school year to 86% being proficient in the 2012-2013 school year with the high year coming in 2011-2012 when 95% of the students were proficient (all students tested).

When looking at 4th graders scores over the past four year we have also seen an increase in student proficiency in math. Overall the student proficiency levels have increased from 90% proficient or higher in 2008-2009 to 94% during the 2012-2013 school year. For the same students in the area of reading, scores have ranged from 92% to 95% during the 2012-2013 school year.

When looking at 5th graders scores over the past four years we have seen good to steady scores in the area of math. Student proficiency levels have been as high as 97% proficient to the low of 93 percent during the 2009-2010 school year. In reading the lowest scores came in the 2009-2010 school year with 83% of the students being proficient to a high of 96% during the 2010-2011 school year.

b.) Overall our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade scores in both math and reading have slowly improved in terms of the number of students proficient. We feel the biggest celebration within our data is with the performance of our students on Individualized Education Plans. In November of 2013 our school was recognized by the Iowa Department of Education for outstanding performance of our students with IEP’s, although our number of students with IEP’s does not constitute a subgroup for state reporting purposes. In Iowa on average, only 32.31% of students with IEP’s are proficient in reading and math or 67% fall short of the state expectations. At Northeast, our students with IEP’s are averaging 75.86% proficiency in reading and math. To break that down, 72.41% are proficient in reading and 79.31% are proficient in math.

In 2008 we implemented a new math curriculum and new math materials (Everyday Math). This was significant new learning for our teachers and it increased the rigor within our 3rd-5th grade math instruction. While the students at Northeast have traditionally scored high on our state ITBS/Iowa Assessments, we did see increased scores for many students. When you examine the data further to look at match-cohort groups in most cases our scores have steadily increased as students transition through our school. Our new curriculum was aligned with NCTM standards and at the time the rough draft of the Iowa Core. Instruction includes a spiral in which students are exposed to concepts several times throughout the school year allowing for different students to attain proficiency with their learning at different times.

In 2009-2010 school year we also implemented a new reading/language arts curriculum along with new consistent reading materials district and building wide. This was, again, new learning and required professional development within our building to assist teachers in the implementation. During the past four years of this implementation, student scores steadily increased in from 89 percent of the students proficient in 4th grade during the 2009-2010 school year to 95% proficient during the 2012-2013 school year. In 5th

grade during these same years proficiency scores have risen from 83% proficient in 2009-2010 school year to 93% proficient during the 2012-2013 school year. This is a significant increase.

We feel the biggest cause of our improved student performance for all students is that we are holding all students accountable for the same expectations. Regardless of the demographics of the students we are serving we are supporting, and providing interventions so that students can be more successful. We have implemented co-teaching within our general education classrooms in which our special education teacher is pushing into the classroom to support the students they work with. We are also replicating this now with our gifted teacher to better meet the needs of our highest achieving students as well.

2. Using Assessment Results:

The staff at Northeast Elementary uses a variety of assessment data to analyze and improve student performance. Iowa Assessments and district-wide administered assessments, such as the district math interims, basal assessments, and literacy benchmark assessments, are used to look for patterns and trends of growth or areas we need to focus on as a staff. These data are used to set building goals. After a building goal has been determined, staff development and learning begins with our Instructional Leadership Team. Wednesday morning late-starts are used for professional learning, planning instruction based on professional learning, and looking at data to determine how we are progressing towards our building goal. Teams of teachers, or professional learning communities, create common formative assessments to determine where instruction needs to be focused to help students reach learning targets.

Annual we have held Goal Review or Data Meetings at Northeast in which we provided extended release time for our teachers to examine as a team the data from common assessments within their grade/district. This examination of student data has taken on many forms over the last five years, but the focus has remained on how our students are responding to our instruction. Teachers have access to an on-line database in which students assessments can be uploaded and reviewed either by student, classroom, grade level, or district. On multiple occasions we have created small data cards for each student in our school and attached the data cards to data walls in which the teachers must determine where along a continuum of learning the student is currently at.

As a result of PLC conversations and Data Meetings, teachers work together to determine which students might need extra support or a General Education Intervention (GEI). The GEI team (also called the NEATeam) supports teachers in looking at student data, diagnosing learning deficits, and creating a plan that works in the classroom to support students. Parents are a part of this process and meet with teachers to determine the best path for students.

Twice each year, parents attend conferences to receive information about students' academic achievement. The conference attendance rate for Northeast Elementary is 99%. Parents are also informed of students' academic success through emails, infinite campus(parent portal), and report cards that go home three times a year.

Communication to the community of students' academic achievement occurs through our districts publication of the results that are shared with our School Improvement Advisory Committee which is made up of stakeholders from throughout the community. This committee also includes teachers, principals, and district office personnel. As the data is shared the committee works together to establish district goals for the next school year. The results are also shared in our District's Annual Progress Report to parents and community members and in the annual AYP submitted to the Iowa Department of Education.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

The staff and leadership of Northeast Elementary School have had many opportunities to share knowledge, expertise and celebrations with multiple audiences over the last few school years. Most recently members of our staff along with our principal have had the opportunity to visit with teachers and leaders from at least eighteen school/districts from across the state of Iowa related to our recent Breaking Barriers award by the

Iowa Department of Education. The award recognizes our school for the high levels of percent proficient of our students with IEP's.

Through visits to our school, phone conversations, and interviews we have shared our experiences around providing systemic interventions and co-teaching to support students with Individual Education Plans. Schools have sent general education teachers, special education teachers, title reading teachers, curriculum coordinators, and principals to observe our co-teaching in our 4th and 5th grade classrooms. We have opened our classrooms to the other schools, offered time to talk and discuss/debrief what they have observed and shared schedules, examples, and beliefs on what works and doesn't work well in supporting our most struggling students. We know we still have more we could improve on and we have also learned from the visiting schools. There is so much benefit to getting teachers out of their own classrooms to see what others are doing.

In January our kindergarten teachers presented to our school board about their implementation of the Common Core within their math instruction. They have spent a great deal of time as a PLC developing common assessments, collecting data, identifying student strengths/weaknesses, developed small instructional groups all related to the Common Core expectations to better meet student's needs and have greatly reduced their dependence on whole group math instruction.

Over the past five years our student assistance team at Northeast has evolved and has become a very high functioning team of teacher leaders who help to support teachers in identifying the need to start interventions for students, writing interventions, and developing progress monitoring tools to track student performance. On two different occasions the building principal has presented to other principals and administration within the district on how the team is developed, what the focus of the team is, and how we have implemented the interventions.

There are other numerous examples including many visits by other districts that have come to learn about our curriculum adoption process and the materials we have adopted.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

At Northeast Elementary School is has been very important to communicate often with our families. Our parents and community at large are very interested in the success or performance of our students and the schools. The teachers at Northeast engage in the typical communications with parents as most other teachers would, through newsletters, emails, phone calls, behavior communication and report cards. In addition to the above mentioned forms of communication, the staff at Northeast have additional expectations regarding students that need additional assistance.

As part of our Northeast Assistance Team(NEATeam) process at Northeast, if a student is in need of an intervention in a specific academic area or behavior, we require our teachers to communicate with our families about the need for the intervention, what the intervention will look like instructionally, and how we will monitor the intervention. This is typically done through a face to face meeting between the parent and the teacher and possibly a NEATeam representative. It is both an ethical and professional responsibility on our part to communicate the academic standing of our students to their parents.

As we started to implement co-teaching between our special education teachers and our general education classrooms our special education teachers needed to communicate with our families about how the instructional minutes of the IEP would be implemented in the push-in model. This communication was very well received as many parents were relieved to know that we were working to keep their children in general education whenever possible. The data of our IEP students has continued to improve.

As our district and school was going through the curriculum review process and implementing new curriculum and materials it was imperative that we also involved our families in learning about what we would be teaching and the methods or strategies that we would be using. Our new math curriculum and materials required us to use a number of math algorithms that were to our students, teachers, and especially

our families. We hosted several family math nights in which we engaged the families in the new algorithms and the math games associated with the new materials/curriculum. By providing these opportunities it also increased the accountability on the part of our teachers to actually implement what we said we were doing. Our math data over the past 5 years has steadily shown improvement.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Over the past five years, Ankeny Community School District has gone through an aggressive curriculum review in the areas of math, language arts, science, and social studies. Teams of teachers and administrators have reviewed the curriculum standards at each grade level to ensure all students are held to high levels of academic success.

In the area of mathematics, a review of core power standards was developed and implemented K-12. At the K-5 level, the program Everyday Math was adopted as the curriculum materials to support the power standards. These materials ensure a spiraling curriculum, so concepts are revisited over the course of a year, as well as over grade levels. At Northeast Elementary, teams of teachers create common formative assessments to determine how students are performing in relation to the power standards. Students who need extra support meet in small groups. Students who exceed the power standards are offered activities that exceed grade level curriculum to extend learning.

For language arts curriculum review, teacher and administrator representatives met to determine a K-12 scope and sequence of necessary skills students would need to obtain to be college and career ready. At the K-5 level, materials were adopted to support a rigorous curriculum which includes major components of scientifically based reading research: vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, word study, phonemic awareness and phonics. To support research based instructional practices in literacy, staff was trained on the strategies of non-fiction read-alouds, explaining word read-alouds, and choosing quality non-fiction texts.

A curriculum team met in the area of science, which followed a similar process to the language arts and mathematics curriculum review teams. At the K-5 level, the National Geographic series was adopted as core materials to support the scientific inquiry process, as well as content power standards in the area of science. These curriculum materials include non-fiction literature to support the inquiry process as well as the skill of reading in the content area of science.

The social studies curriculum review team worked to re-align social studies standards at the K-5 level. Representatives from TCi, a K-12 publishing company, met several times with the social studies curriculum review team. Teacher representatives from TCi came to model lessons in Ankeny elementary classrooms at various grade levels. These lessons were observed by the social studies curriculum review team as well as other administrators and teachers in the district. At the K-5 level, TCi materials were adopted which support the K-5 scope and sequence of skills determined by the social studies curriculum review team.

At the elementary level within our school district we offer a schedule that provides students with exposure to five additional curricular areas. Technology (or Media/Library), Visual Art, Physical Education, Guidance (School Counseling), and Vocal Music. Each curricular area is offered to K-5 students once a week. In addition all of our 5th grade students have the opportunity to participate in Instrumental Music (Band). Both small instructional groups and large group are provided.

All of these curricular areas are staffed with certified teachers with specific expertise and certification in the curriculum area. Teams of teachers and Administrators have met during the past few years to review, revise, and expand the curriculum within each of these areas. State and national standards were examined along with additional input from state or national representative organizations. All of the curriculum areas offer a plan for acceleration and a plan for intervention if needed. Also in most cases update materials have been purchased and implemented across Northeast Elementary and the district.

Each of these curriculum areas also meet with content alike teams weekly as their PLC and once a month they meet as K-12 teams to ensure adherence to written curriculum, examine student data from formative assessments, and plan for future curricular changes. This K-12 focus also ensures that we are continually thinking about possible college and career preparation that is needed for students who may pursue careers in any of these fields.

Northeast Elementary also provides support for our students through our Ankeny Extended Learning Program(AELP/Gifted & Talented), our English as Second Language Services, Targeted Reading Program, Special Education, and having a full-time Instructional Coach available to assist teachers in their learning and growth as educators. Again all of these staff members are fully certified teachers with special certification in the areas they support.

2. Reading/English:

Northeast Elementary School's reading curriculum is based on the Ankeny Community School District's power standards in the area of literacy. A strict adherence to newly adopted curriculum materials was implemented the first year of the new curriculum materials adoption. The purpose for this was to help teachers become familiar with the components of the new materials to determine which pieces were most valuable for students. The use of data from these materials was found beneficial at many grade levels, with some grade levels adapting their own assessment tools to best meet the needs of their students.

Students acquire foundational reading skills through phonemic awareness and phonics instruction. Reading materials are matched to students' developmental needs. Students meet in small groups with the classroom teacher. If the student is not meeting with the classroom teacher, they are engaged in developmentally appropriate independent or partner work, which includes practice in reading, writing, and working with words. Through the use of data, classroom teachers are able to differentiate this instruction based on student readiness.

A common assessment is given to students who are in need of extra support in the area of reading (the Benchmarking Assessment Kit, Fountas and Pinnell). Students who meet district-set criteria qualify for extra support in Targeted Reading. Students who qualify for Targeted Reading meet for 20-30 minutes a day with the Targeted Reading teacher, with addition classroom instruction. These students are monitored carefully to determine growth and areas to focus instruction.

Students who qualify for Targeted Reading are also placed on a General Education Intervention Plan. With this, the classroom teacher works with the Targeted Reading teacher to monitor student growth, graph student data, and create a classroom intervention to target specific areas of literacy learning. Plans are developed along with the NEATeam, a group of grade level teachers and support staff. The NEATeam offers teachers ideas on research-based interventions, ways to collect data, and matching these to a particular student's needs. The NEATeam also works with teachers to provide instructional practices and resources for students who have already reached grade level expectations in literacy.

3. Mathematics:

Northeast Elementary School's mathematics curriculum is based on the Ankeny Community School District's power standards in the area of mathematics. A strict adherence to newly adopted curriculum materials was implemented the first year of the new curriculum materials adoption. The purpose for this was to help teachers become familiar with the components of the new materials to determine which pieces were most valuable for students. The use of data from these materials was found beneficial at many grade levels, with some grade levels adapting their own assessment tools to best meet the needs of their students.

Students acquire foundational mathematic skills through mental math routines, whole group instruction, small group instruction, and partner and independent work and phonics instruction which are matched to students' developmental needs. Students meet in small groups with the classroom teacher. If the student is not meeting with the classroom teacher, they are engaged in developmentally appropriate independent or partner work, which includes practice in problem solving, fact fluency, algebraic thinking, using data, and measurement. Through the use of data, classroom teachers are able to differentiate this instruction based on student readiness.

Based on Iowa Assessment Data from the previous year, the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) determined that while many students scored in the proficient area for mathematics, several students did not make a year's growth. The ILT determined an area for staff learning would be math differentiation. Over the course of the year, staff has learned about incorporating math journaling, the eight Mathematical Practices from the Iowa Core, and problem solving as an approach to math learning. Each grade level focused on their particular area of need to set team goals, PLC learning, and topics for their grade level professional development. For example, first grade focused on learning about diagnostic assessments to determine the nature of students' mathematical skills and areas to grow. Based on their new information, they created small group and independent tasks to meet specific needs of students.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

One ideal aspect of our curriculum at Northeast Elementary, as well as with Ankeny Community Schools, is the integration of literacy themes within science units. The National Geographic materials provide leveled readers within science units so all students can access science content, regardless of reading level. Using the inquiry process, students are able to ask questions and find information through print or online text. Not only does this support students acquisition of foundational literacy skills such as asking and answering questions, finding main ideas and details, and reading multiple genres of text to gain meaning, but students are also practicing 21st Century skills as outlined in the Iowa Core.

Through the science inquiry process, teachers help students to learn collaboration, writing, and presentation skills. Many teachers incorporate technology options as a way to present, allowing students to try new tools that they can then teach to other classmates. The science units provide both hands-on experiences as well as presenting conceptual information in print-based forms. These are real world problem solving skills that students will use throughout their lives.

Using the inquiry process to support literacy learning in science has supported the school's and district's mission statement of ensuring that all students achieve a lifetime of personal success. Students use skills of decoding, comprehension, writing, and synthesizing to process new information and formulate answers to their own questions. Practicing the skills of collaboration, synthesizing learning, and presenting to others are all skills students will need in the 21st Century.

5. Instructional Methods:

Northeast Elementary provides differentiated instruction through multiple methods. Each grade level collects formative data to determine what students know and are able to do in relation to Ankeny Community School's benchmarks and power standards. For example, in kindergarten, teachers observe students' performance towards power standards. They use this information to guide small group instruction. If students are not meeting in a small group with the teacher, they are engaged in an independent activity or game. The activities and games relate to power standards or early numeration skills. Students are offered activities that relate to their specific learning goals. Students may work on iPads or the classroom computer to support these skills.

Students who have met the power standards for their grade level have many opportunities to extend their learning, based on their needs. School schedules are adjusted so students needing grade level acceleration can attend math classes in the next grade level. Students who have met criteria for Ankeny's Extended Learning Program may meet with the AELP teacher in a small group within the classroom, or have extended learning time outside of the classroom with a small group of students.

Students who need extra support in the curriculum benefit from either pull-out or push-in models of instruction. The special education teacher and classroom teacher work together to plan lessons for whole group and small group instruction that best meet all learners' needs. Co-teaching between the special education teacher and general education teachers in 4th and 5th grades in the areas of math and reading has taken place for approximately 4 years.

Students may also work with the Literacy Leader to improve specific literacy skills. The Literacy Leader works with the classroom teacher to collect and share data, plan for instruction, and share skills the student is working on. This helps the student to make connections to the classroom and home.

6. Professional Development:

Professional Development at Northeast Elementary begins with looking at student data to determine the needs of the staff. For example, this past year the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) looked at student data from Iowa Assessment results, as well as reflections from data meetings in which groups of teachers examined student data and reflected on the findings. From this data, the ILT determined differentiation in math would be the primary focus for building professional development. In order to focus in on this topic more, individual grade level teams also set goals as a Professional Learning Community (PLC). Almost every grade level chose to focus on math differentiation.

The ILT spent time learning about differentiation and math concepts throughout the year, which was then shared with K-5 teams and supporting teachers. Each team also received a half day of learning and collaboration. Most teams chose to focus on math differentiation, but each team focused on an area they felt they needed to learn more about. For example, the kindergarten team wanted to learn about different ways to differentiate independent practice stations while they met with small groups. The team read a chapter from a book, worked to put differentiated stations in place, and even shared the work they had done with the school board. The first grade team wanted to learn more about diagnostic assessments to better learn about students' needs. They read a chapter from a book, learned how to give diagnostic assessments, and put learning activities into place that supported specific students' needs. The fourth grade team was interested in creating common formative assessments and learned how to use the KUD Process (Know, Understand, Do) to determine common learning criteria for students which helped them to create common formative assessments to guide their instruction. Each of these activities supports the building goal of helping students grow one academic year and has supported teacher learning in the area of math differentiation.

7. School Leadership

Over the past six years the principal at Northeast Elementary School has worked to create a culture and belief that all students can and will learn. In respect to our district mission statement, "...so every learner is prepared to achieve a lifetime of personal success," we have been committed to continuous learning on the part of our teachers and staff to ensure that we are meeting students needs. The principal's leadership style is one of collaborative decision making working closely with the buildings Instructional Leadership Team (ILT). Teachers complete applications to be a part of the ILT. The ILT which includes grade level representatives, instructional coach, targeted services teacher, and the building principal is the vehicle for which we keep the focus on improving instruction of all staff. Gone are the days in which a teacher leadership team was organized for the principal to communicate out management related information that teacher representatives would then take back to their teacher teams. The Instructional Leadership Team is entirely focused on developing, leading, and providing professional learning opportunities for the staff. The principal may provide some of the vision at times, but it often takes the direction of the leadership team.

The principal's biggest role over the last few years has been to keep the focus on student learning and maintain that we can have high expectations for ALL students. Developing and seeking out teacher leaders for the ILT is also one of the main responsibilities of the building principal. Through the ILT we work to develop and expand the knowledge of the teacher leaders around research based instructional strategies, working with the adult learner, and providing responsive professional development differentiated for teacher needs. The ILT members take the lead in modeling the focus of professional learning communities and have opened their classrooms to each other so that we can grow and improve our own practices. We examine student data and teacher feedback to determine next steps in learning.

At all times at Northeast it has been about what our students need. This culture takes time and has many hurdles such as knowledge, experience, and schedules. We are a more responsive effective staff today than we were before, but we are still on the journey.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Iowa Testing

Test: ITBS/IA Assessment Math
Edition/Publication Year: 2001

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	93	91	93	89
% Advanced	40	48	38	33	25
Number of students tested	97	81	102	94	100
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	6	0	1	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	7	0	1	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or					

Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	91	91	92	89
% Advanced	40	46	38	34	26
Number of students tested	87	70	92	88	91
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The non-qualifying subgroups boxes were checked as our subgroups were less than 10% of the enrollment.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Iowa Testing

Test: ITBS/IA Assessment Math
Edition/Publication Year: 2001

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	95	96	88	90
% Advanced	48	51	47	36	47
Number of students tested	82	104	96	107	111
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	0	1	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	5	0	1	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	95	96	87	90
% Advanced	47	52	49	38	46
Number of students tested	68	94	89	94	109
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: In the 2012-2013 results, we had four students who received alternative assessment due to the nature of their disabilities and as required to align with their IEP's. This resulted in 4.8% of our students receiving alternative assessment.

The non-qualifying subgroups boxes were checked as our subgroups were less than 10% of the enrollment.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Iowa Testing

Test: ITBS/IA Assessment Math
Edition/Publication Year: 2001

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	97	93	93	96
% Advanced	56	60	44	51	41
Number of students tested	107	94	110	111	105
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	1	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	97	93	93	96
% Advanced	54	63	45	50	42
Number of students tested	96	88	98	107	100
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The non-qualifying subgroups boxes were checked as our subgroups were less than 10% of the enrollment.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Iowa Testing

Test: ITBS/IA Assessment Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2001

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	95	86	90	85
% Advanced	28	32	28	26	21
Number of students tested	96	81	102	94	100
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	6	0	1	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	7	0	1	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	96	86	92	85
% Advanced	29	31	28	26	21
Number of students tested	86	70	92	88	91
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The non-qualifying subgroups boxes were checked as our subgroups were less than 10% of the enrollment.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Iowa Testing

Test: ITBS/IA Assessment Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2001

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	90	96	89	92
% Advanced	32	35	37	27	40
Number of students tested	82	104	96	107	111
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	0	1	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	5	0	1	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	89	97	89	92
% Advanced	31	35	38	29	39
Number of students tested	68	94	89	94	109
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: In the 2012-2013 results, we had four students who received alternative assessment due to the nature of their disabilities and as required to align with their IEP's. This resulted in 4.8% of our students receiving alternative assessment.

The non-qualifying subgroups boxes were checked as our subgroups were less than 10% of the enrollment.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Iowa Testing

Test: ITBS/IA Assessment Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2001

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	93	96	83	92
% Advanced	44	28	28	28	23
Number of students tested	106	94	110	111	105
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	1	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	93	97	83	92
% Advanced	44	28	30	28	24
Number of students tested	95	87	98	107	100
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The non-qualifying subgroups boxes were checked as our subgroups were less than 10% of the enrollment.